

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

NXP USA, INC., and NXP B.V.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

IMPINJ, INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:20-cv-01503-JHC

ORDER RE: IMPINJ'S MOTION FOR
JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW

Before the Court is Impinj's motion for judgment as a matter of law under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 50(a) as to infringement. Dkt. # 538. NXP opposes the motion. Dkt. # 542.

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 50(a)(1), "[i]f a party has been fully heard on an issue during a jury trial and the court finds that a reasonable jury would not have a legally sufficient evidentiary basis to find for the party on that issue," the Court may resolve that issue against the party. A motion for judgment as a matter of law under Rule 50(a) should be granted if "the evidence presented at trial permits only one reasonable conclusion." *Torres v. City of Los Angeles*, 548 F.3d 1197, 1205 (9th Cir. 2008) (quoting *Santos v. Gates*, 287 F.3d 846, 851 (9th Cir. 2002)). "[A] motion for a judgment as a matter of law is properly granted only if no reasonable juror could find in the non-moving party's favor." *Id.* (quoting *El-Hakem v. BJJ*

1 *Inc.*, 415 F.3d 1068, 1072 (9th Cir. 2005)). “The evidence must be viewed in the light most
2 favorable to the nonmoving party, and all reasonable inferences must be drawn in favor of that
3 party.” *Id.* at 1205–06; *see also Powell v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.*, 663 F.3d 1221, 1228 (Fed.
4 Cir. 2011) (“JMOL is appropriate when ‘a reasonable jury would not have a legally sufficient
5 evidentiary basis to find for the party on that issue.’” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(a)(1))).

6 The Court DENIES the motion (Dkt. # 538) without prejudice to any post-trial motion.

7 Dated this 20th day of June, 2023.

8 

9 _____
John H. Chun
United States District Judge